Mr. SPEAKER.—Let him pass it on to me. The Hon'ble member wants to refer to an assurance given by the Hon'ble Minister for Education that a particular book which is going to be prescribed or likely to be prescribed, will be withdrawn.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Minister for Education).—Sir, I will make matters clear. It is not the Government which is prescribing that book, but it is the University. I have made it quite clear. I conveyed to the University body the feelings of the hon'ble members of the House, but they say that it is a perfectly all-right book. So what can I do?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Perhaps Sri S. Sivappa is responsible for it!

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Hon'ble Minister said the other day that he would see that the textbook which is prescribed is withdrawn. This is an assurance which he has given on the Floor of this House and how can he now say that he is helpless?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—How can I withdraw a book prescribed by the University for the Colleges? I must make it clear that what I said was that if it was prescribed by Government for secondary schools I would withdraw it. But it is not prescribed by Government for secondary schools; it is prescribed by the University for colleges and the University says it is a perfectly all-right book.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The other day while presiding over a function even the Chief Minister said that obscene books and obscene literature should not be allowed. If that is so, how can an obscene book be prescribed for our young children?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The member must take the word of the Hon'ble Education Minister when he says that he will look into it. After all, the University is an autonomous body which has prescribed the textbook. There are members of the Senate here who the hon'ble member can approach.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—The Education Minister is capable of controlling an autonomous body like the University. Is he not in a position to get this textbook, which contains obscene matters, withdrawn by the University?

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—For the information of the hon'ble member I should say that he is going too far; I cannot control the autonomous University at all. How can I control? I brought it to the notice of the House.

Sri S. SIVAPPA.—Even if he tries, we will not allow it.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Yes, you are right.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Then, is it the intention of the hon'ble Minister to allow such kind of obscene books?

Mr. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble members Sri S. M. Krishna and Sri S. Sivappa would not allow the Minister to interfere. Therefore, the matter ends there so far as this House is concerned.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I request the House to see that such things are controlled, and see that such obscene language books are not there and our children read good books.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will think over.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Sir, the Finance Minister held out a promise that the book would be withdrawn. I leave it to the Minister for Education, Minister for Finance and to the treasury benches to see that the book is withdrawn.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—They might have withdrawn from the library.

(Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Last time there was one matter relating to the call attention motion. There was a slight confusion. So I have prepared a brief note and I would not like to take much time of the House in reading it. I hope the Hon'ble members have got a copy of it. I will read some portions; I hope the members have a copy of the note.

Statement by the Speaker on matters of urgent public importance.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Often times it happens that a Member of the Legislature has got an important matter which he wishes to bring before the House during the period of the Sessions. There are various avenues open to him to do this. By far the best is to bring it into a debate where there is full scope for discussion in all its aspects. This can be done in a debate that takes place while considering bills, budget, resolutions, motions, etc. The next method is to put questions and elicit answers. If the matter is urgent it can be covered by a starred question. If it is still more important it can be done by short notice question. The short notice question is also often times called private notice question. If satisfaction is not derived when the procedure of questions is resorted, the matter can be debated by half an hour discussion. Yet another method is to bring in adjournment motions to discuss matters of public interest. Adjournment motion was associated with the idea to censure against the Government in olden times. The concept is slowly changing. Yet again a Member can raise a discussion on matters of urgent public importance for short duration. The time covered by this is not exceeding 2½ hours. There is no voting. A Member also can resort to the method of calling attention of the Government under Rule 63 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Mysore Assembly.

The purpose of this note is to state briefly the ingredients and incidents on this subject covered by rule 63. In the House of Commons there is no procedure like calling attention of the Minister to a matter of urgent public importance and ask him to make a statement thereon. It is an innovation introduced by our country under the modern parliamentary procedure. It combines the asking of a question for answer with supplementaries and short comments and in which all points of view are expressed concisely and precisely, and Government has adequate opportunity to state its case. Sometimes it gives members opportunities

(MR. SPEAKER)

to criticise Government directly and indirectly and bring to the surface failure or inadequate action of Government on an important matter. The main feature of the procedure is that it begins suddenly, lasts a short while and leaves in its trail consequences of varied character. At the inception, the rule was not so wide as it is to-day. On 7th September 1957, in the Lok Sabha Debates Col. 'C' 12509 it was stated thus: "New rule regarding calling attention to matters of general public importance: It was explained that there was considerable feeling that at present no precise procedure was available to private members to raise at short notice important matters. The procedure of bringing an adjournment motion which was in the nature of a censure motion was restricted in its scope in the present constitutional set-up. It was therefore, considered that some procedure must be devised whereby members shall have an opportunity of bringing important matters to the attention of the Government. It was considered necessary to make provision that a member might, with the previous permission of the Speaker, call the attention of a Minister to any matter of urgent public importance and the Minister might make a brief statement or ask for time to make statement at a later hour or date. The Committee accepted this new rule."

In the two years of the First Lok Sabha the idea of call attention did not attract much notice but during the Second Lok Sabha the procedure fell more and more into disuse. Further at the beginning of the Third Lok Sabha, the procedure received vitality and importance. It has been used systematically and with effect. There has been a fall in the number of motions for adjournment and increase in the number of calling attention notices. Three things have contributed to this:

(1) the decisions are taken instantly and urgent and important matters are brought before the House the same day;

(2) if there be unavoidable urgency, more than one such matter is brought on the same day; and

(3) the members who have tabled notice of the matter are each allowed to ask one question.

There is no limit for a number of notices that a member may table. There is no limit on the number of members who may use this procedure. As a rule the notice must be given on the same day on which a matter has arisen or becomes publicly known. If there is delay the notice may be rejected on that ground. The Speaker goes through these notices one by one and gives his decisions briefly. Speaker's mind and attention are concentrated on these notices. He listens, makes a brief comment and gives his decision, concise and clear. No one is required to record the reasons for his decision and no reasons are communicated to the members. The Speaker is not bound by any precedents strictly, although he has laid down for himself such obvious rules or conventions as for example, whether the matter falls within the cognizance of a Minister of the Central Government, whether the matter may have just started and no

significance may be attached to it. A few days later further development may take place and may become important and urgent and the Speaker may admit it.

When a member is called by the Speaker to call the attention of the Minister to a matter of public importance a member rises in his place and makes a formal request to the Minister to make a statement on the matter which he reads briefly. The Minister may make the statement there and then, if he has got all the facts of the case or he may give such information as is in his possession and request that he may be given time to give further information later. The Speaker usually grants this request. The Minister if he is not ready may straightaway ask for time to collect the information and give it to the House either later in the day or the next day or a few days later as the case may be. Such requests are sparingly made, but when they are made, they are granted. The Minister usually reads the statement to the House and then and there follow questions on that statement by the members who have tabled the notice and answers by the Minister. But if the statement is long the Speaker can ask the Minister to lay it on the Table of the House, then the usual practice is for the members to study the statement and then to ask the questions at a later hour, usually at the end of the day, if so fixed by the Speaker or on the next working day. If the questions are complicated or involve a high level policy of the Government the Prime Minister may intervence and give an authoritative opinion of the Government or promise further consideration of the matter.

Call attention notice based on a press report which is incorrect and in respect of which a contradiction has been issued is inadmissible. Notices of calling attention may be admitted in lieu of adjournment motions. If a call attention notice is received on the last day of a session and is admitted for the same day but the Minister concerned is unable to make a statement for want of adequate notice the Speaker may direct the Minister to furnish to the Legislature Secretariat at a later date a note giving the requisite information for onward transmission to the member who had tabled the notice. Where a calling attention notice is admitted in lieu of an adjournment motion, a separate notice is required to be given. If, however, a notice of calling attention on this subject has already been received from another member, the name of the other member is also clubbed together with the name of the member who has given already notice of call attention motion. Notices for calling attention regarding matters which are not primarily the concern of the Government are not admissible. A notice under this rule (Rule 197 of Manual of Business and Procedure in Lok Sabha) usually renders a notice of an adjournment motion unnecessary. There are some instances where questions on the statements made by a Minister in response to a calling attention notice are not permitted. In exceptional cases the Chair may however permit a member to seek clarification from the Minister on the statement made by him in response to a calling attention notice. Two statements under this Rule are not permissible on the same day. If a member in whose name the notice has been put down in the list of

(MR. SPEAKER)

business is absent from the House when the item is reached, the Minister is not called upon to make a statement. He may, however, lay a copy of the statement on the Table, if he so chooses. A statement so aid is not treated as having been laid in response to the notice but as one laid by the Minister *suo moto*. If however, another member has also tabled a Calling Attention Notice on the same subject on that day and he is present in the House, he may be allowed to call the attention of the Minister to the matter and the Minister may make a statement in response thereto. A statement may be made by the Minister where the matter is important although the member who tabled the notice under this rule is not present in the House. In case the statement to be made by the Minister is long, only a synopsis of the statement may be read out and the complete statement may be laid on the Table. The name of the member giving notice under this rule may be clubbed with other names against a question on similar subject, in case the notice under this rule has been disallowed. A single statement may be made in respect of two or more notices. A notice under this rule is normally disallowed if a statement on the subject is to be made or laid *suo moto* by the Minister. If a notice is disallowed in view of a statement to be made by the Minister *suo moto* the member is informed before the statement is made in the House. A notice may be admitted even if the Minister had informed that he would make a statement *suo moto*. Members should not refer on the floor of the House to notices given by them under this rule.

The position is as indicated above. It is brief and not exhaustive. Now members have often invoked a debate of short duration on subjects covered by the calling attention notice and the statement made thereon. There is an instance where a single matter was raised under the debate on demands in the budget for half hour and later on the same subject was covered by debate on the appropriation bill for nearly an hour, and the same subject again came up in a calling attention notice and questions or clarifications were allowed for about half an hour. Still notice under rule 59 suggesting a debate was made. It was also suggested in the course of replies to the questions that the member may cause a short notice question to be given and then raise half an hour debate. This aspect will come when new or fresh aspects of matter have evolved.

Thus where a matter has been exhausted or dealt with under a debate, normally Neither a Calling Attention Notice nor a short duration debate should be permitted. The rational behind all the scheme is that the members must have an opportunity to debate upon any important matter or elicit information from the Government on such matter. Therefore, it is not proper to ignore the various rules governing the matter and raise a single matter again on the floor of the House.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—Sir, I want to make one submission with reference to the note you have just read. We appreciate the efforts of yourself and the legislature staff. In the Lok Sabha whenever a call attention notice is admitted, the Minister would be called upon to reply or to make a statement within 48 hours. Very recently an appeal was

made to the Speaker of the Lok Sabha that 48 hours is too long and it should be brought down to 24 hours. Here also Sir, the moment you admit a call attention notice, the Minister concerned must be directed to furnish a statement or replies within 24 hours. If that cannot be done within 24 hours, the Minister concerned may make an appeal to the House for extension of time and the Speaker if he so chooses may extend the time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The note is clear on that point. I have made the position very clear. We shall see how it works hereafter.

Sri SIDDIAH KASHIMATH (Shirahatti).—Sir, I have sent a call attention notice regarding the death of 11 children in Gadag area.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have admitted it. It will come in due course.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. GAD 2 SSC 65, dated 18th February 1965 (Further amendment to the Mysore Public Service Commission (Consultation)Regulations 1958)as, required under Article 320 (5) of the Constitution of India.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Minister for Municipal Administration).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Notification No. PLM 13 MLR 64, dated 16th March 1965 (The Mysore Municipalities (Procedure and Conduct of Business Rules 1965) as required under sub-section (6) of section 323 of the Mysore Municipalities Act, 1964).

Sri VEERENDRA PATIL (Minister for Public Works).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the Annual Financial Statement of the Mysore State Electricity Board for the year 1965-66 as required under section 61 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948.

OFFICIAL RESOLUTION

Re: **Survey and Settlement Report.**

(*Debate continued*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—Further discussion on the Official Resolution. The hon'ble member Sri P. Venkatagiriappa has sent a request that he is suffering from fever and that he may be permitted to sit and speak. He has taken 25 minutes. He will conclude within another 10 minutes. This is a very important matter on which every member would like to participate, regardless of party affiliation. I cannot give more time. Two days are allotted for this.

Sri S. M. KRISHNA.—You were just pleased to say that further discussion on the Settlement Reports is allowed only for two days. Every member would like to participate on this very important matter. Kindly allow some more time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We have to act according to the decision taken in the Business Advisory Committee.